

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action mailed June 16, 2008. This Response addresses each of the issues raised by the examiner in the Office Action. Accordingly reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims

In the prosecution of this application, claims 1-17, 2-, 22-30 and 32-34 are pending, and have been rejected in the Office Action mailed June 16, 2008. By way of this amendment, claims 1, 20, 26 and 30 have been amended to further articulate the computing platforms of applicant's invention as now claimed and described.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112, first paragraph

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 20, 26 and 30 have been rejected under 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement for the term “distinct”. The examiner has examined the claims in view of an understanding that “distinct” is analogous to “separate” (Office Action at page 5). Since both these terms carry a plain meaning that implies the separation of components, and the examiner acknowledges the proper meaning of the term “separate” applicant has amended each rejected claim to now include the term “distinct and separate.” This should comport with the examiner's understanding of the term and the record should reflect that this term indeed implies the separation of vision systems as contemplated by this invention. As the plain meaning of this term as used herein is clear and applicant's specification (see, for example Fig. 3 where the separation of systems is clearly shown), the inclusion of these terms does not enter new matter. Rather, this term is sufficiently supported in the specification to afford the claims their proper scope of meaning.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-17, 20, 23-30 and 33-34 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyer, Van Dort, and Silver, as further evidenced by Matrix Vision. In view of the arguments and amendments previously set forth during the prosecution of this application, as well as those presented and/or re-iterated herein, applicant addresses these rejections.

As an initial matter, applicant asserts that the novel arrangement as claimed and described, and particularly illustrated in Fig. 3, is clear from the specification as indicating a plurality of vision processors (VPs), each being a distinct and separate (as herein defined) machine vision system, capable of communicating with other VPs, as well as with at least one user interface system. In this manner, each vision processor is its own machine vision system (i.e. located on its own distinct and separate computing platform), capable of being accessed remotely for efficiency purposes. None of the references cited teach such a novel concept employing a plurality of machine vision systems in communication with each other, and separate from each other, also in communication with a user interface computing platform, over a network.

Conversely, the references cited employ a single computing platform, having multiple tools contained therein for performing processing of images. None of the references teach or even contemplate a structure employing a plurality of machine vision systems for the vision processors.

More particularly, the Silver reference teaches only a single machine vision system, employing a plurality of services, however contained within a single computing platform. There

is no contemplation in the Silver reference to employ a plurality of vision systems, each having its respective, distinct and separate computing platform.

Similarly, both the Meyer and Dan Dort references fail to mention a network, as conceded by the examiner on page 4 of the Office Action. Accordingly, *none* of the prior art references teach or suggest a plurality of vision processors, each on its respective computing platform, and in communication with each other and a user interface to provide a user with a procedure for remotely accessing a plurality of distinct and separate machine vision systems, employing a single user interface, in communication with a plurality of VPs over a network.

Even if the references are combined they still do not teach or suggest employing *a plurality of* vision processor machine vision systems, each provided on a distinct and separate machine vision system, and further comprising a distinct and separate UI computing platform. Conversely, each reference teaches only a *single* machine vision system, and thus when combined, still do not teach applicant's invention as now claimed and described.

Again, this novel structure is nowhere taught or even contemplated in the references, neither when taken alone or in combination, as they only contemplate a single machine vision system. Hence only through use of improper hindsight, having had the benefit of applicants' claimed disclosure can one state that the prior art teaches multiple vision processors on distinct and separate machine vision systems.

Accordingly, the claims are believed to be patentably distinguishable over the prior art, particularly given the amendments to independent claims 1, 20, 26 and 30, to further define the structure of applicant's illustrative machine vision system as including a plurality of computing platforms, not contemplated in the prior art. Thus, any rejections to claims 1, 20, 26, 30, or any

claims depending therefrom are believed to now have been overcome. Dependent claims thereto should also now be allowable as dependent on now-allowable independent claims.

The claims should now be in condition for allowance with each of the objections and/or rejections being addressed or traversed. Accordingly applicant respectfully requests the examiner to issue a Notice of Allowance at the earliest possible date.

Should any unresolved issues remain that require, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney for applicant at 603-336-3026 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Please charge any fee or fee deficiency that is otherwise unpaid to Deposit Account Number 504479.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'W. Loginov', is written over a horizontal line.

William A. Loginov
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 34863

William A. Loginov
10 Water Street
Concord, NH 03301-4844
Tel. 603-336-3026